European Politics.

WHAT IS GERMAN UNITY?

From the Economist.

It is certainly not unknown in the history of man, even if it be unusual, for great multitudes to quarrel for a mere name. Nations before now have been devastated on angry pretexts, to which Swift's satire of breaking the eggs at the little or the big end was a rational cause for bloodshed. If we do not misunderstand the quarrel at present raging in Europe, under the name of order on the one side and liberty on the other, it is really a fight—apart from individual gratification—about the same thing viewed from different sides. It is a repetition on a large and disastrous scale of the old story of the two knights who fought because one asserted that the shield was white and the other that it was black, when it was both, though neither saw the side beheld by the other. Liberty and order are identical; but the people demand the former as the means of securing the latter, and governments uphold the latter in order to give the former to all the people. What will the rational men of this age, and still more the rational men of the next age, say of the Germans, should it turn out that the dispute about German unity, which threatens so much mischief to Germany, is perhaps as worthless and nonsensical an object as ever excited ignorant wrath. Little more than half a century has elapsed since France and England, according to Voltaire, went to war for a few leagues of ice-covered rocks, and we may be permitted to suppose it possible for the democrats, philosophers, revolutionists, and rabble of Germany, not to be wiser now than were the sovereigns and their ministers of these two great kingdoms then.

France, one and indivisible—was one of the cries of the first republic. The meaning then was, to pound all the orders and classes of which the society was composed—nobles and peasants—philosophers and tradesmen—soldiers and civilians—priests and laymen—into one homogeneous mass, and keep them all, within the bounds of France, the slaves of the Parisian central authority. Though it forbad the alienation of an acre from the new government over which the old government had ruled, it did not forbid the extension of France, nor the incorporation with it of many other provinces and kingdoms. France, one and indivisible, embraced the half of Europe, till its great extension, a severe winter, and the unbridled ambition of its chief, divided it again, and reduced it to its original dimensions. Is German unity to be Germany one and indivisible? Are all the people to be obedient to the central authority at Frankfort, to be pounded into one mass and subserve the purpose of extending the central authority over the neighboring lands, such as Schleswig Holstein, the Austrian dominions, perhaps Switzerland, till Germany become what France became under Bonaparte—a very great power, but a nuisance and a plague? Moral, social, and national unity the Germans already have; what they now seek is a political unity which appears a republican or a Bonapartean dream, the offspring of ambition, a thirst for empire, a poor imitation of great conquerors—from Alexander to Bonaparte—trying to achieve by words and parchment what they with more sense and vigor, but less squeamishness, achieved by their swords; and neither worthy of this enlightened age, nor likely to be successful. The spirit of the last great conqueror is by no means dead; it survives in a horde of continental hero-worshippers, who seek for greatness and empire, and aspire to dominate without his genius or his means of success. Some of them are soldiers, some of them military book-worms, men who have read and written themselves into great commanders and great statesmen, and who expect to realize in the world the dreams of their study.

The unity of Germany, for which these theorists have bartered peace, morality, and honor, is not a unity of language and literature; that already exists. One noble language, one rich and diversified literature, increasing with more rapidity than gracefulness or strength, is common to all the Germans, and is spoken and used by nations who form no part of the German Empire. One system of instruction at universities, giving a kind of uniformity, if not exactly one law, to all Germany—one school system—one set of books, different only as the people differ in their religion, are already diffused through the Fatherland. Over a large part of it one custom house system extends. There are diversities in the regulations for the press; nevertheless, the press in Germany is one, and as much united as the press of our own empire. To complete the unity that already exists, it is only necessary to give and secure freedom to the press, and allow it to grow and to work, to extend the bounds of the custom-house system, to abolish passports, to unite all the Germans by free trade and free intercourse, and to bring the governments, as they now exist, by the influence of the press and of general opinion, into one tolerably harmonious action. But instead of building on the old and deeply laid foundations of German unity, the Bonapartean philosophers of Frankfort have schemed to establish a great power, one and indivisible; they have put an end to peace; they have plunged their country into confusion; they have promoted separation and discord, and have strengthened the authority they attempted to put down by the support of all the lovers of security, peace, and order.

The false principle on which they have proceeded is exemplified by their choice of a head. For two centuries has the house of Hohenstauffen sedulously endeavored to build up a great state different from Germany, and at its expense. Personal aggrandizement has been kept as steadily in view by every sovereign of Prussia, since the days of the great Elector, as the extension of the bounds of Russia has been the policy of its sovereigns since the reign of Catherine. Prussia was opposed to Austria, the head of the German empire, and it could only grow in greatness by taking part of the empire to itself. For two centuries it has been the enemy of German nationality. Prussia is not the Fatherland; the language is not Prussian, but German. Prussia, however, is a great power; it can be used to control and subdue the minor states; it can speedily give, it is supposed, to Germany the dignity of a great empire; and therefore the National Assembly of Frankfort offered the King of Prussia the headship of United Germany. It was a false step, but clearly to be traced to a silly ambition of at once constituting Germany a great European power—a poor imitation of imperial France, unjust to all the minor states, and favorable to the least German of all the states of Germany. They have tried such a policy, too, for ages without benefit. They have given the imperial crown to Austria, the most considerable power connected with Germany. Far from promoting the common union and the common advantage, Austria, like Prussia, has endeavored to build up and preserve a great power separate from Germany. It has encouraged neither its literature, its commerce, nor its union. The King of Prussia, it may be expected, would act on the same principle; he would aggrandize Prussia at the expense of Germany; and what the theorists of Frankfort did by selecting the King of Prussia as their head, on account of his power, was merely to repeat the error of their ancestors.

Such a course betrays a great blindness to the past and probable future progress of society. It is not indebted for its development to the engrossing and concentration of political power. A great state may appear to guarantee the security of its members; but in general its very greatness involves it in quarrels of ambition which require immense sacrifices, and are unfavorable to safety and security. In such states property is never so well protected as in smaller states. Holland and Tuscany, and Belgium since it was separated from Austria, with some of the smaller Saxon states, are amongst the most flourishing countries of Europe. In them the arts and sciences have been as successfully cultivated as in the larger continental states, while their people have been enriched. We scarcely required the late experience of France to convince us that such a government and such an assembly as are proposed for Germany are more likely to promote discord than unity. Every strong government insists on having its own will implicitly obeyed; that affronts many persons; with good reason they resist its injunctions; they may be provoked into revolt; discontent is the certain, insurrection and rebellion the probable, consequences of such a government. Every such assembly is the means for making the will of a majority ride triumphant over a minority. It is very apt to beget party disputes; it nourishes faction; it sours those who are down for a season, and makes them rabidly arrogant when triumphant. It is not wise in humble men like those who constitute the leaders in the movement in Germany to try and form a large state, or to aim at unity by establishing a single legislative assembly.

Moreover, it is now seen whether it be for good or for evil, that the influence of constituted government over the affairs of the world is declining. Its authority is weakened by the growing influence of the press, which ought to make all politicians whose art refers not to the past but the future, look more to it than to organizing institutions and forming great states for the peaceable government of society. The clergy are obviously sensible of this great truth, and have everywhere obtained possession of a large portion of the press as the best means of working out their own doctrines. Statesmen, too, use it as the best means of influencing opinion and bringing about the results they desire. Being the organ of the will and the power of the whole society, it necessarily dominates over individuals, including sovereigns; the Frankfort Assembly at once disparaged the press, and convinced men of its own blindness to the future when it placed the King of Prussia at the head of Germany, and framed a spic and span new constitution as the best means of promoting German unity.

As that is conceived at Frankfort, it is a dangerous dream though the conception be vehemently applauded by some English writers, and declared to be an inevitable necessity. German unity, to be obtained, preserved, and strengthened by increasing the influence of the press, and of German literature by procuring free industry, free communication, and one tariff for all Germany, gradually bringing the existing governments, by the progress of opinion, to act according to one rule or under one law, is something worthy to be aimed at, as securing great national advantages and preserving peace. All prudent and rational statesmen must be sensible that, to obtain this end, concessions must be made on both sides. The Frankfort theorists must give up their constitution and their dreams; the sovereigns must guarantee personal security and security to property; they must set the land free and must give perfect freedom to the press, and must abolish restrictions on locomotion. They must substantially concede most of the things the people demand and are inclined to seize. Such a course of proceeding may both promote the unity of Germany and the preservation of its sovereigns. The quarrels now engendered by the hasty ambition of the dreamers at Frankfort, and by the adherence of the sovereigns, to their old maxims of government, are ruinous to the fatherland, and a disgrace to all its philosophers, statesmen, and politicians. It is a scandal to them all that their unity should be nothing but civil war and anarchy.

SPIRIT OF THE ENGLISH PRESS.

From the Spectator.

THE PILLARS OF HERCULES.—To be beaten on the Navigation laws, is for the remnant of the old Tory party to be exterminated; and Lord Stanley's brave stand is but like that of Orlando at Roncesvalles, where Charlemagne and all his host were laid low. In this country, then, the long-waged contest ceases between tyranny and freedom, between Absolutism and Liberalism. The right divine is a forgotten dogma; the liberty of the subject is a title uncontested, and therefore no longer needing to be defended. The surviving differences concern degree, and not fundamental principles. All parties assent to the expediency of political reorganization, more or less general, more or less rapid. Chartism, Conservatism, and modern Liberalism, have common doctrines, and only dissent as to specific measures. The abandonment of the Navigation laws puts the finishing stroke to the old régime.

Are we, then, entering a political millennium? Is Britain really the Island of the Blessed, where dissention ceases; where man will help his brother, each bent on promoting the common good of all, all of each? Hardly. Wakefield hazards a novelty in political economy in recognising any future for Chartism and Socialism. We have a long way to travel before we can even think of harmony as the rule of political life—a long and a doubtful way. Rather, we have entered upon a new and unploughed sea. Free trade and free navigation are the Pillars of Hercules, marking the end of the region which we have known from earliest history, and the opening of a wide unknown ocean of the future. Under what circumstances, with what resources, what councils, do we enter upon that wide unsurveyed ocean?

The subsiding of political antagonisms which we have noted in this country, has not yet begun on the Continent generally. Nay, we seem almost to be upon the verge of a war between Absolutism and Freedom, in which the extremes of Divine Right and Republicanism are likely to take an active part. That the doctrines of Limited Monarchy are rising in favor, is not incompatible with a very considerable amount of influence remaining to the two extremes. It is not in human knowledge to foretell the issue with any certainty; but the interests of this country cannot permanently stand separate from the issue of the struggle between the great political elements on the Continent: as victory remains with Absolutism, dictating from the White Sea to the Mediterranean, with Republicanism prevailing from Venice and Marseilles, perchance to Warsaw and to Moscow, or with the milder and more opportune influence of Limited Monarchy, the reflective consequences to this country must be momentous. In the progress of the struggle, the moral influence of England, backed by her material weight, might be very considerable, largely modifying the balance of the victory. What, then, are the resources with which England is endowed, to invigorate and enlighten her action for the protection of her own interests—for the service of her allies, whose political intelligence and energies her friendship might develop—for the service of mankind, whose permanent interests are so largely at stake?

A difficult and doubtful question. Both as respects internal and external action, England enters upon the future under circumstances greatly altered. With free trade, we must henceforth openly and avowedly depend less upon home supplies, more upon foreign supplies: that is not in itself, commercially and materially, a bad thing; but it tends more to constitute *trade* the sole or chief basis of political science and action. Our statesmanship, abroad and at home, must more than ever turn upon the till.

With the fall of the Navigation laws, we give up all pretension to our old Colonial system; while by the conduct of our administration we are abandoning not only the formula but the substance—the uses of the Colonies, the Colonies themselves.

With the disuse of the Navigation laws in keeping up a nursery of seamen, we avowedly abandon a cardinal point in the maintenance of our Navy; impressment too has probably become impossible, so that *some* wholly new expedient for securing an effective supply of seamen is imperatively demanded. But the want of certain measures is not the most alarming fact; one more alarming is the change which has taken place through the altered habits and avocations of the people, the bulk of which is no longer a maritime people. An Englishman is no longer a born sailor—nor one Englishman in ten, nor one in a hundred.

Still that is not the most formidable change.—With the abolition of "Toryism" has expired the power of public organization by means of the Government; but no equally effective faculty of organization has sprung up in its place. With the increased preponderancy of trading objects, the objects of national feeling have fallen into contempt: there is no reverence for the traditions of the past, no personal attachment for leading men, nor any other natural motive of spontaneous organization. The mechanical organization of "leagues" for special objects is a miserable substitute, without vitality or virtue.

To crown our deficiencies, we have statesmen who show a total incapacity to understand the drift of contemporary history—who boast ignorance of the peril which menaces our Colonies, think that the special constables slew the dragon of Chartism on the 10th of April, 1848, and smile at the idea of any hazardous elements existing in our own society.

Thus England is launched into the wide sea of the future without a maritime people, without nationality, without a policy.

CHOLERA REMEDIES.—The conductors having charge of the train on the road between Philadelphia and Baltimore have been furnished with medicines, in order to afford immediate aid to passengers who may be attacked with the premonitory symptoms of cholera while at a distance from medical aid. This precaution may save lives, and similar measures should be adopted by all railroad conductors and steamboat captains.

The Ohio Sandusky states that two travelling post-office cars are in the course of construction there for the railway line from that city to Cincinnati. "Each car is to have a mail agent or postmaster, whose duties are the same as in any office. He has his office, receives letters, papers, or other mailable matter, puts them in the bags, opens and distributes, receives pay for postage, and, in fact, differs in no way from a stationary city postmaster, save that he moves from place to place."

ACCIDENT AND LOSS OF LIFE.

BINGHAMPTON, N. Y., *June* 11, 9 A. M.

About 20 minutes before 8 o'clock, Saturday evening, a man by the name of Smith, having a lady and girl about 14 years of age in a wagon with him, attempted to cross the track at Nanticoke creek, ahead of the passenger train from New York. The engine came in collision with the horse, killing him instantly, and pitching the girl out of the wagon under the engine, killing her on the spot, upsetting the wagon down an embankment, and breaking the lady's leg in two places, and dislocating one of her shoulders. Smith was somewhat bruised, and is wholly at fault, as he saw the train approaching before he attempted to cross the track. One of the passenger cars was thrown off, but fortunately no one was injured. The coroner's verdict attaches no blame to the railroad company.

THE REPUBLIC.

WASHINGTON:

WEDNESDAY MORNING, JUNE 13, 1849.

THE REPUBLIC.

In a prospectus, issued by the publishers of this journal on the 14th day of April last, we announced, in as concise a form of words as we could employ to make ourselves intelligible, the general purposes and objects contemplated by the establishment of the "Republic." We therein stated that the principles upon which the present Administration came into power; the progressive and liberalizing doctrines which prevailed in the late Presidential canvass; the interests of labor; the cause of science, literature, and general intelligence, should receive from us a cordial, zealous, and constant support. We further made it known that, whilst the Republic would be a Whig Administration paper, it would acknowledge no allegiance inconsistent with the dignity and independence of the press, nor come under obligations incompatible with the utmost freedom of thought, and the largest liberty of action.

The development of these fundamental ideas, in their length and breadth, belongs properly to the sequel. It is only by applying general principles to the discussion of questions of public concern that their interpretation can be arrived at. Apart from the influence they exert in considering measures of national utility, or in adopting the policy of administrations to the business and necessities of the people, the principles of a party, or a programme, are but a rhapsody of words. To the ordeal of time we would, therefore, now submit ourselves without further blazonry, if universal usage did not require of us an amplification of the contents of our prospectus. We submit more readily to the prevailing custom, because some of our most distinguished cotemporaries set us an example of deference, by occasionally condensing the elaborations of many years into formularies of convenient circulation.

The principles upon which the present Administration came into power are embodied in a letter written by its distinguished chief, pending the last Presidential election, and known throughout the canvass as the first Allison letter. The leading idea evolved in that important document is, the emancipation of Congress from the rigors of the veto power, a power designed by the Constitution to be conservative, but which has been too often used as a personal prerogative of the Executive. Where the people have clearly the right, under the Constitution, to adopt a system of domestic policy, and shall elect a Congress to carry into effect that system, it is an abuse of power to interpose the Executive veto between them and their ascertained will. And in determining the constitutionality of a measure, the decisions of the various Departments of the Government, the acquiescence of the people, and the interpretations of the courts of law, are the safest, nay, the only safe guides.

Upon the subject of the tariff, the currency, the improvement of rivers, lakes, and harbors, the will of the people ought to be the law of the land. These are matters within the competency of the country to consider and have settled by representatives whom they may select to give their convictions the form of positive law.

With equal willingness do we subscribe to the doctrine that war at all times, and under all circumstances, is a national calamity, to be avoided if compatible with national honor; and that the true policy of the country is opposed to the dismemberment and subjugation of other countries by conquest. We cannot imagine a combination of circumstances at all likely to arise to overrule a principle so strongly fortified by experience and supported by the sympathies of our better nature; yet in a contingency which might leave no escape from collision, except in national abasement, the country will be safer in the guidance of those who make justice, truth, and humanity, the basis of international communication, than with such as adapt their pretensions to the tastes of restless agitators and their performances to a wholesome consideration of the power of an adversary.

We might here enlarge upon the foreign policy of the country at this, the most momentous, crisis that has ever occurred in the affairs of Europe; but other and more seasonable occasions will present themselves for this duty. Suffice it to say now, that whithersoever our sympathies might lead us, that however the natural sentiment of America may respond to the aspirations for freedom, which have thrown a whole continent into a revolutionary ferment, this Government can be little else than a spectator—an anxious one, perhaps, but still a spectator of the convulsions of expiring dynasties and the throes of sudden, incomplete, or experimental organizations. There is one kind of propagandism and assistance—the safest, best, and most enduring—which is left us. It is to set an example to the Republicans of Europe of a nation founded upon the idea of the capability of man for self-government—a united, free, and prosperous people, moving with steady and certain step in the achievement of the great and legitimate purposes of the Confederacy—the dignity and strength of the whole, the prosperity and happiness of the individual members of the compact.

We have said enough to indicate our views of the constitutional powers and the foreign policy of the Government. In regard to the domestic policy of the country, little else need be said than what may be inferred from our Prospectus. The legislation of the General Government should be shaped to the wants of the industrial interests of the whole nation. Congress, in our judgment, should be guided less by theory than by the claims of agriculture, manufactures, commerce, mechanic arts, and mining, to the fostering care and encouragement of the law-making power. The measure of this encouragement should be regulated by the requirements of these leading interests as experience shall make them manifest. Care should be taken that the exact amount of protection, incidentally extended to every article of domestic manufacture and consumption, should be known.

We not only believe that Congress has the power to improve our great highways, rivers, lakes, and harbors, but that the power should be used. It costs less to beautify our own than to blast a neighboring country; and, whilst in the performance of the one office we strew the earth with the seeds of a goodly harvest, in the other we raise up apples of Sodom to tempt and to plague ourselves.

We desire to see the Government, in every way in which it can be done, encouraging the "ennobling arts of peace." Our chivalrous army and gallant navy command as much of our respect as admiration for noble deeds can inspire. We would see these branches of the public service maintained by a country to whose history they have each contributed a large share of glory. They are adorned by gentlemen of the highest character; by scholars of approved science, and by patriots who have illustrated their love of country by sacrifices in her cause. But whilst we would not destroy these, we would yet encourage the "ennobling arts of peace."

Indeed, we regard our mission as one of peace—peace with foreign powers, and peace at home. We reject that construction of the Constitution, and the policy based upon it, which recognises in the General Government almost unlimited power in dealing with foreign States—which admits its right to exercise a charitable spirit towards strangers—but denies our own people any claim to have their wants considered by their own Government, and even grudges them the incidental advantages which flow from enactments having any other object in view than the protection of their interests.

It might seem that this cold and heartless system was brought forward to weaken the ties of the Union by accustoming the masses to expect nothing warm, generous, or even just from their Government. Whilst we would not see the Government forget its liberality in its foreign business, we would have our own people feel the succor and support of a wise, liberal, and encouraging domestic policy. The great thoroughfares of the country, our majestic rivers, and superb lakes, should be made safe for the people and the produce continually afloat upon them. By multiplying and improving the means of interchanging the products of labor, and thus stimulating intercourse between the citizens, of distant sections of the Union, the wealth of the country is increased by processes which pluck out the hatred which bad men have contrived to sow amongst our people. The love of the Union will grow stronger as the North and the South are brought closer together; the citizens of the several States will think better of one another as they come to know each other better; and with the animosities which demagogues have engendered for evil purposes will pass away the importance of mischief-mongers and the vocation of disunionists. It will be our constant endeavor to heal the feuds which have sprung out of the consideration of sectional questions, or national ones in a sectional spirit. We would not give one hour of hearty good will between the North and the South for all Mexico. We hold the restoration of good understanding between the extremes of this Union in higher consequence than whatever might be gained by the most brilliant conquests. We think that the destinies of the foreign civilized world, the interests of the human race as connected with the spread and progress of liberal opinions, are more deeply concerned in the perpetuity of this Union, in the fraternization of its several parts, than in the wars and revolutions which are ploughing up the foundations of the worm-eaten systems of Europe.

We regard the dissolution of the Union as an impossibility—a peaceful separation is certainly so. But were it possible that this or that State secede, this or that star fall, and the remainder move on, a broken, yet a harmonious constellation, we would not consent to the experiment any sooner, than now, when we believe the lost Pleiad would drag her sisters down the abyss of night until darkness and blood engulph them all. But we can pursue this theme no further, and with it we close what we have to say in anticipation of the future.

THE CASE STATED.

It is now a little more than a twelvemonth since the Democratic party met in Convention at Baltimore, under the auspices of the distinguished gentleman who sat for a session in the Speaker's Chair of the House of Representatives with the English mission in his pocket. They nominated LEWIS CASS for the Presidency, and promulgated a series of resolutions which they styled *the platform of the campaign*. In these resolutions they embodied a number of barren generalities, some doctrines that nobody denied, some assertions that nobody believed, and a residuum of Locofoco principles, which presented the real issues of the impending political contest. They announced to the people their hostility to Internal Improvements, their faith in the VETO as it had been exercised under the then existing Administration, their opposition to any modification of the Subtreasury or of the Tariff of 1846, and their entire confidence in the principles, capacity, and integrity of a President whom they dared not present as a candidate for re-election. Their nominee "carefully read" these resolutions, promised a faithful adherence to them, and professed a cordial approval. They presented the topics on which he was willing to take an appeal to the people.

This was the state of things when the WHIG National Convention met at Philadelphia. It was as emphatically a WHIG assembly as ever convened; composed of ardent, earnest, thorough-going, WHIG statesmen, trained in public affairs, eminent in political ability, strong in the confidence and affections of their party, and devoted to the great cause of governmental purification and reform. They were anxious to rescue popular rights and liberties from the gulf of Executive Absolutism. They sought to save the country from a degrading submission and subservience to the will of a single man. They sought to restore the true dignity of the elector by fortifying the independence and elevating the position of his representatives. These were the prevailing and primary objects with a majority of this WHIG Convention; for in their attainment they saw their way clear to the accomplishment of everything that the public interests required, which the public voice might demand. Those ends realized, and the pyramid, then subverted, would again rest upon its base. The dominion of true democracy would be restored. Public policy would take its form and color from the GREAT PRESENT of the nineteenth century—the age of invention, improvement, and progress—and our statesmen, no longer dogmatizing over the musty records of a venerable local legislature, would apply, in their true spirit, the principles of the Constitution of the United States to advance the interests, answer the exigences, and promote the welfare of the American People.

Such were the sentiments which governed the deliberations of that Convention. The names of several candidates for the Presidential nomination were presented for their consideration. Public opinion, however, directed their attention with marked emphasis to one man. Popular sympathy was with him. His unaffected simplicity of character, his unquestioned integrity, his moderate and determined bearing under the most trying and disastrous circumstances, the brilliancy of his illustrious achievements; all these elements of strength and popularity indicated to practical and discerning statesmen that, by the nomination of General TAYLOR for the Presidency, the overthrow of the then dominant dynasty would certainly be accomplished. Any other nomination would be an experiment—this was success. Still a sentiment prevailed that the political views of General TAYLOR were not sufficiently explicit and exclusive to justify a WHIG Convention in tendering him a WHIG nomination. In spite of the universal feeling in his favor, there was a reluctance to adopt the cause of any man who had not been scarred with the wounds of political conflict, and identified with the various fortunes of the party from its earliest formation. At this stage of the proceedings, and in this state of feeling in the Convention, Judge SAUNDERS obtained permission to read a statement from the delegation of Louisiana, in reference to the position of General TAYLOR. That statement settled the controversy. Without it, General TAYLOR would not have received the nomination. With it, his election was no longer considered doubtful. From that statement we copy a single paragraph:

"General TAYLOR, we are also authorized to say, *will hail with entire satisfaction any nomination besides himself*, being persuaded that the welfare of our country requires a change of men and measures, in order to arrest the downward tendency of our national affairs. On making this announcement, the delegates of Louisiana wish it to be distinctly understood that it involves no inconsistency on the part of General TAYLOR in case the choice of this Convention should fall on another. If General TAYLOR's friends in this Convention withdraw him, it will be their act and not his; and *by the act of uniting with this Convention his friends withdraw his name from the canvass unless he be the nominee of this Convention*; and we deem it proper to assure the Whigs of the Union, that we desire the nomination and election of General TAYLOR to the Presidency on no other than national grounds."

Such was the pledge which the Louisiana delegation gave to the WHIGS of the country. General TAYLOR was persuaded that the welfare of that country required a change of MEN AND MEASURES in order to arrest the downward tendency of our national affairs. What change? The substitution of one Chief Magistrate for another, and the elevation of seven WHIG gentlemen to seats in a cabinet, where they might go through a certain routine of official duties, under the manifold embarrassments with which they would be surrounded by unfriendly subordinates in places of confidential relation? Was that a change competent to arrest the downward tendency of our national affairs? Was that a change competent to effect any substantial improvement in administration? Since the institution of human government, was the experiment ever made of carrying on the affairs of a great nation upon such principles?

The pledge then given by Judge SAUNDERS to the WHIG Convention, contemplated a practical, substantive change in men and measures, adequate to the objects of a consistent, systematic, and harmonious administration of public affairs. Was this pledge ratified? In his letter of June 29, 1848, to the committee of the Independent Taylor party of Maryland, General TAYLOR took ground which broke up the independent organization in that State, and resolved it into its original elements. "Under the general authority, then," he said, "thus given these gentlemen, (Judges WINCHESTER and SAUNDERS,) I shall deem whatever statements they may have made to be right and proper; and, confident in their integrity, and in the sincerity of their friendship for me, *I shall sustain them without qualification.* I now, therefore, take upon my own shoulders the responsibility of the acts of the Louisiana delegation, *and am prepared to stand by their consequences in their length and breadth.*" In the same letter General TAYLOR disclaimed the desire of receiving the vote of any man, Whig, Democrat, or Native, on any other ground.

Thus, then, was the position of General TAYLOR distinctly defined before the country. The canvass went on. It was substantially a WHIG and DEMOCRATIC contest. Many elements became involved in it. The personal popularity of General TAYLOR proved a most important element. It was aided by the unpopularity of his Democratic opponent, and by the defection of a large wing of the Democratic party, under the lead of Mr. VAN BUREN. To a great extent it was aided by the gross personal abuse and calumny that were showered upon our candidate by the presses of the late administration; by the falsehoods of suborned affidavit-makers, and by the malignant strictures of inflamed office-holding partisans. Many members of the Democratic party united with us because they sympathized with General TAYLOR in his views of the importance of a governmental reformation; and this accession to our ranks furnished an important element of our success. But it was by the zeal and devotedness—the labors and the sacrifices of the great WHIG PARTY of the Union that the battle was fought and the victory substantially achieved. Without their aid, General TAYLOR would not have received an electoral vote. With all their aid, any other WHIG candidate would probably have been defeated; but in every aspect in which it can be viewed, the result of the late election was eminently the triumph of the WHIG PARTY—of a party disembarrassed of its dogmatic ultraisms and obsolete ideas, infused with the spirit of the great principles which are developing, and the great scenes which are enacting around us, and consolidated by the recognised claim of President TAYLOR to the respect, confidence, and gratitude of the American People.

It is not in the power of any opposition to interpret such a triumph as the result of a mere personal controversy. No party cunning can varnish it with a gloss so deceptive. The support which General TAYLOR received was no blind homage to a successful soldier; it was the tribute of a grateful and confiding People to a man whose honesty of purpose had become an universal conviction, and to whom they looked as the Providential instrument of a political revolution, by which the downward tendency of our national affairs was to be effectively arrested. In this view how insignificant becomes a formidable show of opposition, based upon garbled passages from confidential correspondence, isolated from their context, accompanied by deceptive and insidious comments, and illustrated by a copious employment of epithets familiar only to the vocabulary of Billingsgate!

MARIA EDGEWORTH.

The last steamer brings the news of the death of Maria Edgeworth at the advanced age of eighty-three years. This admirable writer has long enjoyed a reputation like the calm and unbiassed judgment of posterity. She has lived to see her works pass from the region of transient popularity to that of permanent fame, and in her own life has reaped that harvest of influence and renown not usually gathered till after death. No man or woman in this generation need be told of the surpassing excellence of her various writings; how full they are of admirable and penetrating good sense, of just views of life, of delicate and playful wit, of graceful and humorless satire, of natural pathos, and of the soundest morality; all commended by a style, simple, flexible, energetic, and picturesque. The moral value of such teachings as we find in "Vivian" and "Helen" is of the highest kind. Here is nothing ideal or visionary; but the disastrous consequences of common faults, such as we are every way tempted to commit, are sent like an arrow to the heart, with such power and point as to arrest the most thoughtless and startle the most insensible. Especially as a writer of children's books has she been a most generous benefactor to all who speak the English tongue. Who does not recall with delight the happy hours in which he first hung over those charming books, "Frank," "Rosamond," "Harry and Lucy," and "Parent's Assistant"? Who does not look back upon them as linked with the sweetest recollections of the golden time of life? In this department we believe the very first place will be accorded to her by general consent. Time, which is ever sweeping away into its oblivious gulf such yearly swarms of children's books, makes no impression upon the indestructible elements of hers.

But it is not only as an author that Miss Edgeworth is to be honored and remembered. The eldest (we believe) of a very large family, her whole life was dignified and adorned by the exercise of the most generous and disinterested affections, and of constant thoughtfulness for others. The object of love, admiration, and esteem to her numerous relatives, she recognised the claims of all, and all shared in the benefits of her warm heart and her sound judgment. To the poor in her neighborhood she was a constant benefactor—exemplifying in her own practice all those judicious plans and rules for the aid of the needy which will be found illustrated in more than one of her works.

The old age of this admirable person was singularly serene and happy. Time neither chilled her affections nor impaired her understanding. Her interest in all good things continued unabated to the last. Miss Edgeworth had more than one correspondent in this country, and her letters were frequent, and always full of expressions of cheerfulness, of gratitude for the blessings she had enjoyed, and of the liveliest sympathy in all that concerned her friends, and marked with all the wisdom, the good sense, and the playfulness of her published writings. Never was age seen in a more attractive form, more exempt from the narrowing and chilling influences so apt to come over those whose lives have been less wisely spent.

TO THE MANY WHIGS,

And friends of the present Administration who have exhibited an earnest interest in our behalf, we cannot omit to present our sincere thanks for their unsolicited attentions. They have enabled us to start from a point which is usually reached by political journals, after a long career of difficulty and doubt. The only question with us now, is not as to our success, but as to the measure of it. This we now feel will be limited only by our usefulness. It will be our own fault if we fail to merit the generous confidence which has been extended to us, though we may hardly hope to realize the too partial expectations of friends.

With a deep sense of the responsibility of the editorial vocation, and determined ever to maintain the independence without which no press can secure or deserve the public respect, we shall certainly fail in many points to please ourselves, and how then can we hope on all points to satisfy our readers? But our best efforts never shall be wanting—nor shall we ever fail in fidelity to what we deem the true interests of the American people.

TO THE PRESS OF BOTH PARTIES.

For the very general kindness with which they have received our enterprise on its announcement, we return our warmest acknowledgments. We shall labor to merit the confidence they have extended to us in advance, as we most cordially reciprocate their good wishes for our prosperity. There are but few instances in which the sentiment has been expressed of an unfriendly character, and but few of even reluctant welcome. The right hand has been generally extended to us with a hearty grasp. Where it has been withheld, we have no reason to complain. We solicit no unwilling recognition, but can readily adapt ourselves to such fellowship as our cotemporaries may be disposed to cultivate. In kindness or in coldness we shall continue to move on with them as long as our inclination may lead us, saving only the uncertainty of life and health—for we have embarked in an enterprise that rests upon no other contingency. To all, therefore, in the spirit of good will we send our respectful greetings, and assure all that the dignity of our common mission shall never be impaired in our hands.

THE WEEKLY REPUBLIC.

The first number of our Weekly paper will be issued on Wednesday next, the 20th inst. We call attention to the terms as published at the head of the first page.

THE TRI-WEEKLY will be published to-morrow, and regularly every Tuesday, Thursday, and Saturday.